

- (2) to place the specific names *caerulescens* Linnaeus, 1758 and *cupreus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in combination with the generic name *Carabus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

Proposal 3. The species *Pterostichus vulgaris* (Linnaeus, 1758) (with *Carabus melanarius* Illiger, 1798 as a synonym) is a very common and well-known eurosiberian species, unmistakably identified by all coleopterists. The name *Pterostichus vulgaris* is well known and is in widespread use. There is no risk of confusing it with *Amara lunicollis* Schiødte, 1837 (= *Carabus vulgaris* Panzer, 1797, non Linnaeus, 1758) which belongs to another tribe of carabid beetles. The designation of lectotype for *Carabus vulgaris* Linnaeus, 1758 made by the late Professor Lindroth is a sufficient solution and there is no need for any action by the Commission.

Proposal 4. The species *Bembidion rupestre* auctorum (with *Bembidion bruxellense* Wesmaël, 1835 as a synonym) is a common and well-known european species. The name *B. rupestre* is in current use by all coleopterists and to replace it by *B. bruxellense* would disrupt stability and cause confusion. I therefore propose another solution and ask the Commission:

- (1) to use its plenary powers
- (a) to suppress all designations of type specimen hitherto made for the nominal species *Cicindela rupestris* Linnaeus, 1767, and, having done so,
 - (b) to designate the type specimen of *Bembidion bruxellense* Wesmaël, 1835, as neotype of *Cicindela rupestris* Linnaeus, 1767;
- (2) to place the specific name *rupestris* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Cicindela rupestris*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

COMMENTS ON APPLICATION FOR SUPPRESSION AND VALIDATION OF ELAPID SNAKE NAMES. Z.N.(S) 2128

(see vol. 33: 73-84; vol. 34: 8)

- (1) By G.L. Underwood (*City of London Polytechnic*) and A.F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London, SW7 5BD*)

We are writing to let you know that the request by Smith & Smith for the suppression and validation of names related to the ELAPIDAE has our wholehearted support.

One small point occurs. In 1893 Cope (*Amer. Nat.*: 480) proposed the family-group name URIECHINAE based on *Uriechis* Peters, 1854 (*Monatsber. Akad. Wiss. Berlin*: 623), at that time considered a valid name, but now a subjective synonym of *Aparallactus*. The synonymising of these two genera occurred before 1961, and although the family-group name APARAL-

LACTINAE Bourgeois, 1968 was proposed after 1961 we feel that Article 40 of the Code should apply. Thus APARALLACTINAE should be cited with the date "1968 (1893)."

(2) By Hobart M. Smith and Rozella B. Smith (*University of Colorado, U.S.A.*)

Boulenger (1895, *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (6) vol. 16: 172) was the first to synonymize *Uriechis* Peters, 1854 with A. Smith's previously overlooked *Aparallactus* of 1849, and all workers since then have agreed with that allocation, although the two nominal genera have different type-species.

In the period between the rejection of *Uriechis* as a junior synonym and the proposal of APARALLACTINAE in 1968, *Aparallactus* was placed either in the BOIGINAE, based on the oriental genus *Boiga* and a much different group, as now understood; or in the COLUBRINAE, a highly composite group, or if strictly interpreted, very different in composition; or in the LYCODONTINAE, a South African group of considerably different character. All these subfamilies pertain to the COLUBRIDAE. Since 1968, Bourgeois' APARALLACTINAE has been recognized by several authors in perhaps a dozen works.

Article 40 does not, as we understand it, apply to the case of APARALLACTINAE versus URIECHINAE — indeed, the case is not clearly covered by the Code. Article 40 provides that the validity of a family-group name and that of the name of its type-genus are to be judged independently of each other in circumstances arising after 1960; but *Uriechis* was rejected as a junior synonym in 1895. Article 40 does not state explicitly that a family-group name based on a generic name rejected before 1961 is invalid, and that inference cannot, therefore, be automatically drawn.

Likewise, although APARALLACTINAE has undoubtedly gained general acceptance, it was not proposed until 1968, so that it is not covered by Article 40a.

Nevertheless, it is clear under the Code that when Mademoiselle Bourgeois decided to propose a new subfamily to contain *Aparallactus*, she would have been quite wrong to have based its name on the invalid generic name *Uriechis*. It therefore seems to us that this is a case in which the Commission could use its plenary powers to rule that URIECHINAE is not to be given priority over APARALLACTINAE when the two are regarded as synonyms. This is, however, a point on which the Commission must be guided by the views of interested zoologists.

There is a further correction to be made to the original proposal. This asks, in paragraph 27(1)(d) for the suppression of the family-group name BUNGAROIDEA Fitzinger, 1826. It is, however, open to any zoologist to regard *Bungarus* Daudin, 1803 (*Mag. Encycl.*, VIII^e Année, vol. 5, No. 20, ventôse an XI [Feb.—Mar. 1803]: 434) as the type-genus of a family-group taxon in its own right. It should not, however, be allowed to displace either ELAPIDAE or HYDROPHIIDAE. In detail, therefore, we wish:

(1) to replace proposal (1) (d) by the following: 'to rule that the